

E 713
.P47

Pettigrew, Rich. F

Inquiries relative to
the
Phillipine Islands

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 717 892 8

permalife®
pH 8.5

E 713

.P47

Copy 1

F. Pettigrew 5000
S. F. R.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD F. PETTIGREW,
OF SOUTH DAKOTA,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, and Monday, January 15, 1900

WASHINGTON.

1900.



SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD F. PETTIGREW.

Thursday, January 11, 1899.

The Secretary of War, under consideration of the following resolution submitted by Mr. LORGE on the 3d instant:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to ascertain, and report to the Senate, whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day on which fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipino forces, and whether General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting between our forces and those of the Filipino forces was not authorized by him, and that General Aguinaldo had to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies, so that both that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer." And did General Otis send a reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to report, and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?"—

Mr. PETTIGREW said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that both of the Senators from Massachusetts should make such inquiries as they choose and seek such information as they desire. I think it is entirely proper. If they believe the information is necessary in order that they may the better discharge their duties, they ought to seek it, and the Senate should give them the opportunity to do so.

Of course the details of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LOBBE] might be considerably extended in the pursuit of valuable information for the public. We might inquire whether our soldiers did not desecrate churches and plunder sanctuaries; whether they did not kill prisoners, murder women, burn houses, rob the persons of the inhabitants of the country, both men and women, of their jewels, and so on, covering the usual train of horrors which follow the operations of hostilities in the field.

It seems to me that my resolution is exceedingly pertinent. It brings before the people of the United States ask to have answered. They want to know what our course has been in regard to the Philippine people previous to the commencement of hostilities, what our course was immediately after hostilities began, what our relations were to those people, and whether or not war on our part is justified. Certainly no nation should wage war unless there is the best of cause and unquestioned justice on the side of the aggressor. For the purpose of ascertaining these parti-

nent facts, as they seem to me to be, I introduced a resolution on the 12th of December, which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the flag of the Philippine republic was carried by vessels in the bay of Manila, and whether the flag of the Philippine republic was ever saluted by Admiral Dewey or any of the vessels of his fleet at any time since May 1, 1898. Were Spanish prisoners delivered over to the Philippine forces at the time of the surrender at Subig Bay? Did a vessel commanded by the forces under Aguinaldo, flying the Philippine flag, accompany the vessels *Concord* and *Raleigh* back to Subig Bay in June, 1898, in order to compel the surrender of the Spanish forces?

One object in offering this resolution was to ascertain whether or not the Filipino people had been the allies of the United States Army and Navy; whether we had operated with them against a common enemy. The resolution was laid upon the table on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CHANDLER), and the only reason given for this attempted suppression of information was that if the Senate passed the resolution, such action would be telegraphed immediately to the insurgents.

The object of concealing conditions or operations in time of war must be to keep from an enemy information it does not already possess. If what I state in the resolution is true, the facts were well known to the insurgents at the time the facts were created. If we saluted their flag, they knew it; if their vessels came from Subig Bay to Manila, and if they asked Admiral Dewey to assist them in the conquest of the Spanish garrison at that place, and our vessels went back and captured the garrison and turned the prisoners over to the insurgents, the insurgents knew it at the time. Therefore the passage of the resolution or the promulgation of the facts to the American people could not encourage the enemy.

Mr. President, the object in this suppression of information is to keep from the American people certain transactions which after history will record. The trouble with these imperialists is that they confound the Government of the United States with their puny President. The trouble is that his interests are paramount to the interests of the whole people of this country, and that the desire for political success has more bearing upon grave questions than the mere encouragement or nonencouragement of the insurgents. My resolution was laid upon the table. The information asked for was denied. I want it answered specifically, because I think it is pertinent to this controversy.

On January 3 of the present year I offered another resolution—that is, the pending resolution—which reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether General Torres, one of the officers of the Philippine army, came to General Otis with a flag of truce on February 5, 1899, the day after the fighting commenced between our forces and those of the Filipinos, and stated to General Otis that General Aguinaldo declared that fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by him, and that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of a width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflict between the two armies, and whether General Otis replied that fighting having once begun must go on to the grim end. Was General Otis directed by the Secretary of War to make such an answer? Did General Otis telegraph the Secretary of War on February 9, 1899, as follows: "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference. Have declined to answer?" And did General Otis afterwards reply? Was he directed by the Secretary of War to reply, and what answer, if any, did he or the Secretary of War make to the application to cease fighting?

This resolution embodies direct questions. They are pertinent questions, and upon them I desire information.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he has information that the contents of the resolution are true?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not assert in the resolution that the contents are true, but I believe they are true; for if they were false, every imperialist in this body would be in great haste to secure replies, and they would have passed my resolution without any delay whatever.

Mr. ALLEN. Has the Senator any information in his own possession about the truth of the assertion contained in the resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will reach that subject later. I will come to it in the course of my remarks.

Mr. ALLEN. I want to know, because I am in hearty sympathy with the resolution, and I think it ought to pass. I do not think there is anything of such a sacred character that the American people should not know it, this being a Government by the people and for the people.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will come to that, Mr. President. The facts recited in the resolution are facts, and they are therefore true. I am much obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for bringing out this fact at this time. I will produce abundant proof of these facts later on in my remarks.

Mr. President, is war such a flippant thing to engage in that when an enemy with whom we are fighting declares that the conflict was not intentionally commenced and desires to cease fighting in order that peace may be restored and the killing of men stopped, we should answer that the war having commenced, it shall go on to the grim end, and when later—but a few days later—the request for a cessation of hostilities is again made, our general telegraphs to the Administration that he has declined to answer. It seems to me the questions are so pertinent, so pointed, so important, Mr. President, that they ought to be the subject of a separate resolution: not be clouded by a series of events which have occurred since, not clouded by these horrible deeds which occur on both sides when men are engaged in shedding each other's blood.

Therefore I believe that resolution is important. Any other resolutions which may be presented covering other phases of this controversy will not be objected to by me. If information is wanted by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I am willing he shall secure it. But I want these questions—these two or three pertinent questions—answered, and answered directly and at once. That is why I object to the substitute. The substitute of the Senator from Massachusetts is what? It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to send to the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interest, all reports and dispatches relating to the insurrection in the Philippines, and especially any information as to communications or correspondence with the insurgents, from the 1st of January, 1898, on the part of any officer in the military, naval, consular, or diplomatic service of the United States.

I have no objection to that information being secured, but I do not wish to have action delayed on these two great important questions until the information desired by the Senator from Massachusetts can be secured; neither do I care to leave discretion to the President as to whether his reply shall be in accord or consistent with public interests. The people of the United States,

who are sovereigns in this country, have a right to know the facts regarding which I ask.

Leave it to the discretion of the President! Why, this resolution, Mr. President, should be amended so that it will accord with the facts. The President himself is unable to distinguish between his own interests and the interests of his country, between the political contest which is about to come on and the question of the destiny and duty of the United States. This resolution might be changed so as to read: "If not inconsistent with the interests of the President as a candidate for reelection," for that will govern the answer we shall get. The concealment of news, the suppression of facts, has marked the course of this miserable and wretched transaction from the beginning.

Even the report of General Otis, which is sent to us purporting to give a history of the war, does not contain all the facts and was either censored at this end of the line or the other. It does not contain his report of the 6th of April, which gives an account of how the fighting commenced and who inaugurated the war. It does not contain MacArthur's report, before whose forces the fighting was begun. MacArthur describes the opening of hostilities, but that report was not included. It does not give any recital since the war commenced of repeated efforts on the part of the insurgents to cause the cessation of hostilities; it does not give the telegram which Otis sent to the Department dated the 9th of February, 1899, and which is as follows:

Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference; have declined to answer.

His report does not contain that exceedingly important telegram. Fighting commenced on the 4th. On the 9th General Otis telegraphed the Department that Aguinaldo desired to cease fighting and have a conference, and that he had not answered. There is no reference in the report to so important an incident as the officially expressed desire of the commander of the enemy to stop the effusion of blood.

There were innumerable efforts on the part of Aguinaldo to stay the tide of war. He sent flags of truce time and time again, accompanied by communications, asking if hostilities might cease; and what General Otis did with those messages of good will, and what the Department here did with them, is not contained in Otis's report; all were censored out of it. For what purpose? The facts are known to the insurgents. They are not known to the people of the United States. They were omitted to conceal the true situation from the people of the United States.

That is not all, Mr. President. This process has been going on at both ends of the line. Of Otis's telegrams, of Otis's reports, it is well known that only portions were given to the American people. Negotiations with regard to the Sulu agreement were mangled and partially denied until after the election in Ohio. The President himself sent a proclamation to General Otis, which I will read. It is dated the 21st of December, 1898:

PRESIDENT'S PROCLAMATION.

With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris on the 10th instant, and as a result of the victories of the American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfillment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation

and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands becomes immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

Here, then, is a declaration on the part of the President that we had acquired sovereignty by purchase and that we proposed to extend a military government over the entire group of the Philippine Islands. What was the situation on that day? We occupied simply the city of Manila and a small promontory about 20 miles from the city.

Mr. HOAR. What is the date of that proclamation?

Mr. PETTIGREW. The 21st day of December, 1898. The city of Manila was invested by the army of the Philippine republic. That army had built earthworks from water to water, 14 miles in length, clear around that city, hemming in the Spanish garrison at the time the city was surrendered, and the position of the Filipinos was maintained up to the date of this proclamation. This was the message sent to a government exercising jurisdiction over millions of people, maintaining an army of 30,000 men surrounding the city of Manila, occupying only the country they had conquered and captured from Spain. Then the President goes on:

In performing this duty, the military commander of the United States is enjoined to make known to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands that, in succeeding to the sovereignty of Spain, in severing the former political relations of the inhabitants, and in establishing a new political power, the authority of the United States is to be exerted for the sovereignty of the persons and property of the people of the islands and for the confirmation of all their private rights and relations. It will be the duty of the commander of the forces of occupation to announce and proclaim in the most public manner that we come, not as invaders or conquerors, but as friends, to protect the natives in their homes, in their employments, and in their personal and religious rights. All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity so far as may be possible.

Here was a direct declaration of war. Lay down your arms, submit to our sovereignty, to our military rule throughout the whole of these islands, or we will proceed against you by force of arms and compel you to do so. What is the use, after the issuance of this proclamation, of quibbling about who commenced the war?

But General Otis, fearing that something might occur that would be disagreeable in this connection, did not give out the proclamation sent to him. He altered it materially. He altered it so that it was not the same proclamation. He altered it so that it read as I shall now read. This is to the people of the Philippine Islands:

Instructions of His Excellency the President of the United States relative to the administration of affairs in the Philippine Islands have been transmitted to me by direction of the honorable the Secretary of War, under date of December 28, 1898. They direct me to publish and proclaim in the most public manner to the inhabitants of these islands that in the war against Spain the United States forces came here to destroy the power of that nation and to give the blessings of peace and individual freedom to the Philippine people; that we are here as friends to the Filipinos; to protect them in their homes, their employments, their individual and religious liberty, and that all persons who, either by active aid or honest endeavor, cooperate with the Government of the United States to give effect to these beneficent purposes will receive the reward of its support and protection.

The President said all those who surrender, all those who yield, will have protection, and those who do not will be caused to yield

by force of arms. Mr. Otis, feeling that this proclamation of the President was too harsh, that it might involve trouble, censored it, as the President has evidently censored Otis's report. So Otis was willing to deceive, swindle, and defraud the people of the Philippines by putting out a proclamation which was not transmitted to him to issue, and the Administration is willing to humbug the American people at this end of the line with a meager report of the facts in regard to this whole subject.

The entire wretched business is one of duplicity and concealment—an evident effort not only to deceive the people of the United States, but the people of the Philippine Islands. But as soon as General Otis received this proclamation he sent it to General Miller, down at Iloilo, and Miller promulgated it exactly as he received it, and within four days the genuine proclamation was back in Manila and all its brutal phrases were presented to the people there. They were suddenly stunned by the edict which declared war against them and which so unexpectedly announced that they should not have their liberty, for which they had sacrificed so much life and so much property.

Mr. GALLINGER. What were those brutal phrases? I should like to have one or two of them read.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will read them to the Senator:

All others will be brought within the lawful rule we have assumed, with firmness if need be, but without severity, so far as may be possible.

A straight and square declaration of war—an announcement that if you do not surrender, if you do not lay down your arms, if you do not give up your liberty, we will make you do all these things by force of arms. The other is as follows:

The military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory.

The military government of the United States was to be extended over those 30,000 men in arms and over that government of a sister republic, founded upon a constitution similar to ours. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire asked the question, for I have thought for a long time that those who are maintaining this policy on the part of the United States were ignorant with regard to the facts and stood in need of information.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it strikes me that his declaration that those expressions of the President's message are brutal is absolutely refuted by reading them. The President of the United States used no brutal language and has not done so during the period of hostilities.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Now, Mr. President, let us see what General Otis says about this matter. If we have an ally and he has been fighting with us and has lost thousands of men in contact with a common enemy, for his advantage and for ours, and he has established a government and has helped us capture a city with a garrison of 13,000 men, and we then turn around and say to him, We have purchased title, from the persons whom we have been jointly assailing, to your country and to your land, and if you do not lay down your arms and surrender to us the liberties for which you have been contending, we will make you do it by force of arms. And if that is not brutal language and that is not a brutal course, then the estimate of these things placed upon

them by the Senator from New Hampshire must be quite different from what has been placed upon them by the history of the world through all time.

Otis says, with regard to this proclamation, as follows:

Before publication of this proclamation I endeavored to obtain from able Filipino residents of the city an expression of opinion as to its probable effect upon the population, but was not much encouraged. A few days thereafter they declared the publication to have been a mistake, although the foreign residents appeared to believe the proclamation, most excellent in tone and moderation, offered everything that the most hostile of the insurgents could expect, and undoubtedly would have a beneficial influence.

Perhaps the proclamation which Otis put out, if it had not been for the President's proclamation itself, which came to them from Iloilo, might have been tolerated. How do we know? Otis sends out a lie to insurgents; Miller sends out the truth. A few days afterwards the truth comes, and then the difficulty of course ensues. Here is what he says with regard to the President's language:

After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos with whom I was daily discussing political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States Government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein, such as "sovereignty," "right of cession," and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives.

Remarkable, is it not, that such words as "sovereignty" and "cession," such words as "conquest" and "oppression," might have disturbed the inhabitants? How gratifying it must be to the President to have this censor of his praise the Executive language!

So, Mr. President, the war was commenced, and yet the insurgents used every effort and every endeavor to prevent actual hostilities. I think I can prove from the record that such was their course.

But before I conclude with regard to this censorship question I want to call attention to the report of the Associated Press. Robert M. Collins, who represented the Associated Press in Manila, in connection with the concealment of facts and of truth from the people of the United States, makes the following statement in an interview which the press representatives had with General Otis. He threatened to court-martial the correspondents for sending the truth to the United States. Mr. Collins says:

But when General Otis came down in the frank admission that it was not intended so much to prevent the newspapers from giving information and assistance to the enemy (the legitimate function and, according to our view, the only legitimate one of a censorship), but to keep the knowledge of conditions here from the public at home, and when the censor had repeatedly told us, in ruling out plain statements of undisputed facts, "My instructions are to let nothing go that can hurt the Administration," we concluded that protest was justifiable.

In other words, Mr. President, the purpose of the censorship in Manila was not to keep facts from the enemy, not to keep information from the enemy, but to keep it from the people at home, the people of this great Republic. We have adopted a new policy along with the adoption of an empire and a pseudo emperor—a policy of no longer taking the American people into our confidence and consulting them with regard to questions of great national moment. Our military censors are instructed not to cut out from

the dispatches sent to the newspapers in this country that which might help the enemy, but that which might hurt the Administration at home. Such instructions are issued by the Administration itself, and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy must be obeyed by his subordinates. Military power is imperial, and the imperialist employed it not for the country's good, but to attain personal political ends.

Continuing, Mr. Collins says:

Otis had gained the idea, from the long submission by the newspaper men to his dictation, that it was a part of the duty of the Governor-General to direct the newspaper correspondents as he did his officers. Much of the censorship was conducted by him personally, the censor sending a correspondent to the General with any dispatch about which he had doubts. The process of passing a message was identical with the correction of a composition by a schoolmaster, Otis or the censor striking out what displeased him and inserting what he thought should be said; or, what came to the same thing, telling the correspondent he must say certain things if his story was to go.

And in this way these correspondents say they were compelled to send falsehoods home to us. What is more, Mr. President, further, Mr. Collins says:

Recently I filed what I thought a most inoffensive statement that the business men who had appeared before the commission had advocated the retention of the existing silver system of currency. The censor said: "I ought not to let that go. That would be a lift for Bryan. My instructions are to shut off everything that could hurt McKinley's Administration. That is free silver."

Now then, Mr. President, I object to the resolution or amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts because he proposes to leave to the President the discretion as to whether I shall have my questions answered or not. How can I leave that to the President and expect to get the information when he instructs a censor to deny to the American people the facts for fear that the truth will hurt his Administration? How can we expect to be given the facts when Otis's reports suppress everything almost that would be of importance as against the conduct and course of the Administration and gives us that only which he chooses to divulge?

Now, Mr. President, who commenced the war? I contend, in the first place, that the President inaugurated hostilities before the treaty with Spain was ratified, when he sent his declaration of war to Otis to be transmitted to the people of the Philippine Islands. What is more, Mr. President, Mr. Otis, in his report, in the first letter he wrote to Aguinaldo after he took command, made the statement which I shall read. I might preface this by saying that at the time Manila fell the insurgents had conquered the island of Luzon. The Spanish flag floated over only one port. They (the Filipino republic) had occupied many of the other islands, and shortly afterwards captured the city of Iloilo.

Their troops had taken 10,000 Spanish prisoners. They had captured garrison after garrison. They had several small vessels which patrolled the coast flying their flag. They surrounded Manila with a cordon of earthworks. They had 30,000 men in the trenches. When General Merritt went there, he asked the insurgents to allow him to land his forces on the beach in order to take the city of Manila. He sent General Greene, who was instructed not to recognize Aguinaldo or his forces, to try and avoid that. but nevertheless, by some hook or crook, to get a lodgment upon the beach.

I will read from the statement of Francis V. Greene, major-general, with regard to this matter:

General Merritt arrived at Cavite in the *Norport* on the afternoon of July 25, and, after examining the ground the following day, promptly decided two points: First, that the attack would be made along the shore; and second, that it was necessary to get the insurgents off to one side, so as to give us the right of way. He was very anxious to avoid any entangling alliances with Aguinaldo, with whom he had no direct communication. He therefore sent his chief of staff, on the afternoon of July 28, with a verbal message directing me to persuade the insurgents, if possible, to evacuate a portion of their trenches; but I was to do this on my own responsibility and without intimating that I had any instructions to this effect from him. I had previously met General Noriel, who commanded the brigade of insurgents nearest to the beach, and on receiving General Merritt's message I sent my orderly, who spoke Spanish fluently, to find this general and give him a most polite message that I desired to see him on matters of common interest.

What was the purpose of the President? When General Merritt was sent to the Philippines he went with different instructions from those which had been previously given. Previous to that time Aguinaldo had been armed by us, taken to the islands by us, had declared constantly that he wished to set up a government of his own, and that his people desired independence and had adopted a constitution, had established a government, and that they had consulted with Dewey about it. Dewey had said in one of his dispatches that he went ashore to consult with the Filipino people with regard to the establishment of a civil government. Their flag had been saluted.

Spanish prisoners had been turned over to their government. But suddenly the policy of the Administration changes, and the departure was instigated by England, in my opinion, for the tone of the English papers about this time changed. They began to talk about our duty in the Philippines. The men who were dominating England were opposed to war with Spain because they held Spanish bonds. They were in favor of our conquering the Filipinos because they would like to get more of the bonds of the United States. The great money oligarchy which has ruled the world for the last twenty or thirty years, dictated the march of armies, and the movement of navies, bidding war to commence or war to cease, has now crossed the Atlantic, and is to-day wielding the destinies of the great Republic and directing every movement, every thought of the servile President of this most corrupt and un-American of all Administrations.

So General Merritt was to try to fool the Filipinos and prevail upon them to do what he wanted and not let them know what was his purpose. He was armed with different instructions from those that had been given to anyone else. He tells General Greene to get possession of a piece of the shore; to do it without letting the Filipinos know that he recognized them in any way, but to accomplish it. Aguinaldo said he would give possession of the shore if they would make the request in writing. Upon that he withdrew his troops from the trenches and our troops took possession of 400 yards of Aguinaldo's works, from the shore part way around Manila. Without giving the request in writing, we simply promised that it should be sent the next day. This is contained in General Greene's statement.

Now what occurred? Manila surrendered. It was 14 miles around Manila, and of that 14 miles all but 400 yards was occupied by the Filipino forces. When the city surrendered we took 13,000 Spanish prisoners, according to General Greene's report, and there

was no fighting. In fact, the surrender had been arranged. We were simply to make a demonstration and then the Spanish garrison was to lay down its arms. They were to give themselves up to us that they might avoid capitulating to the Filipinos, who had surrounded them. Thus the surrender of the Spanish forces was secured without bloodshed, except for an accident, or except for such bloodshed as the generals commanding our armies thought was necessary in order to humbug the insurgents, so they would be content to allow us to enter the city without them.

Immediately upon our occupation of the city we began to push the insurgents back. We gave them nice talk. We told them we were their benefactors. We pointed to our resolution with regard to Cuba. We declared that we had the highest motives and that conquest would not be thought of—that it was immoral. Thus we gained possession of one point after another.

In demanding the retirement of the Filipino troops the first letter which Otis wrote to Aguinaldo is as follows. Aguinaldo had protested against retiring from territory which he had conquered by sacrificing the blood of his men. A parley ensued.

On September 8, 1898, General Otis forwarded to Aguinaldo this communication, the first one he had sent to that officer:

It only remains for me to respectfully notify you that I am compelled by my instructions to direct that your armed forces evacuate the entire city of Manila, including its suburbs and defenses, and that I shall be obliged to take action with that end in view within a very short space of time should you decline to comply with my Government's demand; and I hereby serve notice on you that unless your troops are withdrawn beyond the line of the city's defenses before Thursday, the 15th instant, I shall be obliged to resort to forcible action, and that my Government will hold you responsible for any unfortunate consequences which may ensue.

Here, then, on the 8th of September was a declaration of war, a threat to an ally who had done as much against the common enemy as we had done.

Permit me to believe that my confidence in the sound judgment and patriotism of yourself and associates is not misplaced.

We were parleying with Spain. It was long before the treaty was made and many months before it was ratified.

You will please pardon me for my apparent unnecessary delay in replying to your communication of the 27th ultimo, but press of the duties connected with the administration of the affairs of this city is my excuse.

In conclusion, I beg to inform you that I have conferred freely with Admiral Dewey upon the contents of this communication and am delegated by him to state that he fully approves of the same in all respects; that the commands of our Government compel us to act as herein indicated, and that between our respective forces there will be unanimity and complete concert of action.

Now, this is Otis's report, from which I read:

On September 13 a commission sent by Aguinaldo and consisting of three members, one of whom was the treasurer and another the attorney-general of the insurgent government, called for the purpose of discussing the subject of my letter of the 8th. They asked me to withdraw it and simply request in writing that the insurgent troops retire to the line designated by General Merritt, which I refused to do, stating that unless they withdrew as directed we would be obliged to resort to force.

Pretty talk, is it not, toward an ally who was fighting with us? If this Administration had a spark of honor when they sent General Merritt there they would have told the whole truth in his instructions to the insurgents, would have told them that they had nothing to expect but slavery at our hands, instead of still parading as their friends.

They then asked that I withdraw the letter and issue a request unaccompanied by any threat to use force, as Aguinaldo was fearful that he would be unable to remove his troops upon a demand, to which I replied that the letter of the 8th instant would stand. They then said that as the demands of that letter must remain unchanged, the insurgents would withdraw as directed therein, but that if I would express in writing a simple request to Aguinaldo to withdraw to the lines which I designated—something which he could show to the troops and induce them to think that he was simply acting upon a request from these headquarters—he would probably be able to retire his men without much difficulty; that, of course, they themselves understood the direction to withdraw, which would be obeyed, and thereupon repeated their desire to obtain a note of request, whereupon I furnished them with the following.

Then comes a request simply to withdraw, designating the line, and this request was complied with.

Now we complain and the Administration justifies its commencement of the war upon these people because they were uneasy during this time; that threats were heard; that assertions were made that they had a right to independence. Aguinaldo issued a proclamation in answer to the President's proclamation, declaring that he sought independence for his people.

Now, Mr. President, who did begin the war? Here is Otis's letter of the 8th of September, saying that he would resort to war if they did not surrender to him some of the territory which they had conquered from Spain. Here is the President's proclamation, saying, "If you do not surrender the islands on the 21st of December, I will wage war against you to the death."

What is more, it is well to inquire who fired the first shot. It appears that there was a town between the lines of the two armies, occupied by the forces of Aguinaldo—a town 150 yards in advance of the line of the American troops—and that Otis wished to obtain possession of it. He therefore entered into an agreement to have Aguinaldo withdraw his pickets therefrom and retire to a greater distance.

This was done. On the night after this had been accomplished a patrol of the insurgents entered the abandoned town. A patrol is not a war party; a patrol is simply to pick up stragglers. They had occupied the place the night before, and they sent a patrol in the evening to see if any of their men had remained behind—if there were any stragglers in this village. We had occupied the place as a picket station, and when these Malays, who do not speak our language, came along, a Nebraska boy ordered them to halt, and they did not halt.

It is very strange, is it not, that the insurgents did not understand the Spanish or the Malay tongue of the Nebraska boy? He fired upon them and killed a lieutenant, and within a few minutes two or three more Filipinos were killed; and thus the war was begun. And who started it? We commenced it by the declaration of war on the part of our President, by every act of ours which indicated that we did not propose to give them their freedom. We inaugurated the conflict by killing the first man. But what does General Otis say about this? On page 92 of this report you will find the following statement:

It is not believed that the chief insurgent leaders wish to open hostilities at this time—

It is not believed they wished to open hostilities. Let us see. On the same page he describes the battle of Manila:

The battle of Manila commenced at half past 8 o'clock on the evening of February 4 and continued until 5 o'clock the next evening.

The engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the killing of two or three or four Filipino soldiers who composed the patrol, which was not a war party, by a picket of ours; and then what? "The engagement was one strictly defensive on the part of the insurgents and of vigorous attack by our forces." Then we rushed upon their works, and the killing and destruction were well under way. We took their trenches and drove them back. And yet it is claimed by the President, in his proclamation, that the Filipinos struck a foul blow. Who really struck the foul blow? Who was guilty of duplicity? Who was guilty of deception through the whole of this miserable transaction?

General Otis conceals the rest of the facts. The report of General MacArthur is not here, but I have read the reports of various soldiers, for the South Dakota troops were along this line. I have talked with many of them, and there is no possible question but that we were first guilty of shedding blood; that we began the attack, and that we followed it up.

What occurred, Mr. President? General Rives, of Minnesota, who was in charge of the city of Manila at the time fighting commenced, in an interview said:

But I can tell you one piece of news that is not generally known in the United States. On Sunday, February 5, the day after the fighting began, General Torres, of the insurgents, came through our lines under a flag of truce and had a personal interview with General Otis, in which, speaking for Aguinaldo, he declared that the fighting had been begun accidentally and was not authorized by Aguinaldo; that Aguinaldo wished to have it stopped, and that to bring about a conclusion of hostilities he proposed the establishment of a neutral zone between the two armies of any width that would be agreeable to General Otis, so that during the peace negotiations there might be no further danger of conflicts between the two armies. To these representations of General Torres General Otis sternly replied that the fighting, having once begun, must go on to the grim end.

Mr. SPOONER. What date was that?

Mr. PETTIGREW. February 5.

Now, Mr. President, under all these circumstances, I would like to know what more Aguinaldo could have done. What more could he have done than continue to fight as long as resistance was possible? If I were a Filipino, I would fight until I was gray, if I were not killed before, against this unholy and infamous aggression.

I do not indorse the sentiment, Mr. President, of the Senator from Nevada, that having once commenced we must go on. That would compel him to join his brother if he found him stealing. That would compel him, if he found his comrades committing any crime, to join in the crime until it was consummated. If we are wrong, this Government can take no higher or grander position before the nations of the world than to acknowledge it.

My country, right or wrong, is a sentiment I indorse with this qualification: When right, to keep it right, and when wrong, to make it right. Neither do I confound the President with the Government. He is but our servant, and if he pursues a wrong course, if he precipitates us into a war unjustly and wrongfully and undertakes to override the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, then I am against him, and it is my privilege to attack his position.

I believe he is wrong in this contest. I believe my country can only be great and grand by pursuing that honorable course which

has marked our career in the past, and by exercising that powerful influence which we can exercise and have exercised all over the world since we became a nation, because of the honor and dignity of our course and the respect we have always maintained for the rights of others. We have reached the turning point.

Are we to abandon this grand history; are we to pursue a course of aggression and wrong, plunder and robbery; on the English principle that having once commenced we must continue to the end? What would we think of the greatest athlete of the world to-day in insisting that, having begun the beating of a boy of 12, he should beat the boy to death in order to convince the world that he was strong?

Mr. President, if it takes more courage to do right than to do wrong, then the American people and the American nation should commence at once. Empire has been acquired before only to ruin the nation that started upon a career of conquest. Rome with her legions robbed the world. When the Roman Empire was founded most the people owned 12 acres apiece—12 acres per family—indicating a dense rural population. No foreign foe could march through that compact rural population of land owners to the wall of Rome. They were successful farmers and prosperous, and they made mighty soldiers. Cincinnatus left the plow and led legions on to victory. But during the first century of the Christian era centralization had done its work; the lands had been absorbed by the usurer and gathered into vast estates, cultivated by tenants and often by slaves.

Spain once had an empire which covered almost the world—greater than Rome or any other people ever acquired. Where is Spain to-day? No nation can pursue a course of wrong toward others and long preserve its own liberties. No nation can long give to its people happiness and prosperity, equality, necessary to the preservation of its institutions, when it proceeds to disregard the rights of other nations or plunder other men, no matter what the color of their skin.

Monday, January 15, 1900.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I did not at this time intend to address the Senate at length upon this subject, for I had expected that the resolutions of inquiry which I had offered would be adopted and the information thus furnished from official sources before the debate commenced. But the discussions which arose and the impressions which were made seem to have precipitated a general discussion of the question. I shall begin my remarks to-day by reading from one of Lincoln's speeches the following paragraph:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under the rule of a just God can not long retain it.

I believe that is true. I believe the reflex action upon our own people of the conquest of other peoples and their governments, against their will, will gradually undermine free institutions in this country and result in the destruction of the Republic. What are the arguments urged why we should force a government upon the people of the Philippines? The President of the United States says they are not fit for self-government. From my observation of history I believe there are no people fit for any other form of government. Governments are instituted, not bestowed, and therefore derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Any nation of people are capable of maintaining as good a government as they are entitled to have, and when they can maintain a better government they will evolve it, and you can not give them a better government than they can maintain for themselves. A form of government is the result of the social compact, and therefore the government of a people will be as good as the average of the individuals composing the community are willing to have. The American Indians maintained a government, and for them a better one than we have been able to bestow upon them. The Esquimos in the arctic region maintain a government of their own, suited to their condition and their circumstances, and it is a better government than anybody else can give them. Would their condition be improved by sending to them foreign governors and a foreign council to enact laws and direct their course and method of life, to guide them in their civic and civil affairs? So with every other people the world round. There is nothing in the history of the colonies of the so-called Christian nations of the world to encourage the idea that we can give to this people a better government than they are able to maintain themselves.

The old doctrine of the divine right of kings, of the hereditary right to rule, is a doctrine that we disputed and controverted when we established our Government and when we announced the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. So proud have we been of that discovery that each year we have celebrated the birth into the world of a new theory a new doctrine with regard to governments: and four hundred constitutions have been framed after ours. So powerful has our example been throughout the world, that nation after nation struggling to be free has adopted our form of government.

No nation, no people, in all time and in all history ever impressed such a powerful influence upon the human race as this Republic, and for this reason alone. Empires have been established, a trail of blood has been drawn across the world, and vast aggregations of people have been brought under the rule of an emperor or a monarch since history began, but no people, no nation, in the history of the world has ever produced such a powerful effect for good upon the human race as this great Republic, and simply because of the doctrine laid down by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence.

Is it an old doctrine that all Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Some have said that it was a nursery rhyme sung around the cradle of the Republic. The doctrine is new. It was announced but a century ago, a day in the birth and life of nations, and yet this great Republic, boasting as we have on each recurring celebration of the event, proposes now to abandon it for the old doctrine and the old theory and the old idea of selfishness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] says that the Declaration of Independence does not contemplate that all governments must have the consent of the governed: that only those must have the consent of the governed that we think capable of self-government. Under that theory no people in the world are capable of self-government unless they first get our consent that they are fit to give their consent to a form of government which they wish to set up. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] says that governments derive their just powers from the consent of some of the governed. Thus the Senator from Indiana would

extend the doctrine of imperialism to whole nations of people, while the Senator from Connecticut would extend the doctrine of imperialism to every nation and every people, for he declares that the consent of some of the governed only is required.

Thus we drift back to the divine right of kings, to the doctrine that those who govern shall determine who of the governed shall give their consent. Thus construed, our glorious Declaration becomes a mockery and a fraud. Therefore, when we meet each year to celebrate the instrument's birth into the world, the orators of the Republican party will have to explain its meaning and tell the multitude that our notions, our opinions, of the Declaration have been wrong for a hundred years.

Lincoln, in his speech at Springfield, on June 26, 1857, thus defined his notions of the Declaration of Independence:

In those days our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all and thought to include all; but now, to aid in making the bondage of the negro universal and eternal, it is assailed and sneered at, and construed, and hawked at, and torn, till, if its framers could rise from their graves, they could not at all recognize it. All the powers of earth seem rapidly combining against him. Mammon is after him, ambition follows, philosophy follows, and the theology of the day is fast joining the cry.

* * * * *

I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all men; but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral developments, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal with "certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all, and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that "all men are created equal" was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain, and it was placed in the Declaration not for that but for future use. Its authors meant it to be, as, thank God, it is now proving itself, a stumbling block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation, they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack.

It seems to me that Lincoln, with his prophetic vision, must have seen this day, when prosperity, breeding tyrants, should undertake to declare that the Declaration of Independence no longer applies to anybody but the people whom we decide are capable of self-government. It stands to-day as a stumbling block; it is the hard nut to crack that the imperialists of this country find on this occasion, and it will confront them in this contest on every stump and on every platform in the land. Now, let us see what Stephen A. Douglas in that controversy said about the Declaration. I believe my imperialist friends must have been reading Douglass' argument. Said Lincoln:

I have now briefly expressed my view of the meaning and object of that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "all men are created equal."

Now let us hear Judge Douglas's view of the same subject, as I find it in the printed report of his late speech. Here it is:

"No man can vindicate the character, motives, and conduct of the signers

of the Declaration of Independence, except upon the hypothesis that they referred to the white race alone, and not to the African, when they declared all men to have been created equal—that they were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain—that they were entitled to the same inalienable rights, and among them were enumerated life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Declaration was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British Crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country."

Lincoln says:

My good friends, read that carefully over some leisure hour, and ponder well upon it; see what a mere wreck, mangled ruin, it makes of our once glorious Declaration.

"They were speaking of British subjects on this continent being equal to British subjects born and residing in Great Britain."

Why, according to this, not only negroes, but white people outside of Great Britain and America, were not spoken of in that instrument. The English, Irish, and Scotch, along with white Americans, were included, to be sure, but the French, Germans, and other white people of the world are all gone to pot along with the Judge's inferior races.

I had thought the Declaration promised something better than the condition of British subjects. But no; it only meant that we should be equal to them in their own oppressed and unequal condition! According to that, it gave no promise that, having kicked off the King and lords of Great Britain, we should not at once be saddled with a king and lords of our own in these United States.

I had thought the Declaration contemplated the progressive improvement in the condition of all men everywhere. But no; it merely "was adopted for the purpose of justifying the colonists in the eyes of the civilized world in withdrawing their allegiance from the British Crown and dissolving their connection with the mother country." Why, that object having been effected some eighty years ago, the Declaration is of no practical use now—mere rubbish—only wadding left to rot on the battlefield after the victory is won.

I understand you are preparing to celebrate the "Fourth" to-morrow week. What for? The doings of that day had no reference to the present; and quite half of you are not even descendants of those who were referred to at that day. But I suppose you will celebrate, and will even go so far as to read the Declaration.

Why, Mr. President, when we quote the Declaration of Independence or the words of Lincoln, the imperialists of this country say that our words are telegraphed to Manila and give encouragement to the insurgents. If, on the last Fourth of July, I should have read here Lincoln's words, that people who disregarded the rights of freedmen in others can not long retain their own liberty, I suppose Otis would have had me arrested for an insurgent and insisted that I was giving aid and comfort to the enemy; and if I had there read the Declaration of Independence or the words of Lincoln as referring to all people, no matter what their color, I would have been driven from the islands or placed in prison. Has it reached the point that wherever our flag floats men can no longer, without being called rebels, quote from Abraham Lincoln or read the Declaration of Independence. Lincoln goes on to say:

Suppose, after you read it once in the old-fashioned way, you read it once more with Judge Douglas's version. It will then run thus: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all British subjects who were on this continent eighty-one years ago were created equal to all British subjects born and then residing in Great Britain."

Could you make it any more absurd if on the next Fourth of July you should amend it to accord with the opinion of the Senator from Indiana or the Senator from Connecticut? Lincoln says:

And I now appeal to all—to Democrats as well as others—are you really willing that the Declaration shall thus be frittered away; thus left no more at most than an interesting memorial of the dead past; thus shorn of its vitality and practical value and left without the germ or even the suggestion of the individual rights of man in it?

On another occasion, in Lincoln's speech in Chicago, Ill., July 10, 1858, he makes this allusion to the Declaration of Independence, and it is so very pertinent to the present occasion and to this debate that I read it as an absolute refutation of the position of the imperialists on this subject.

I might say here, Mr. President, that I allude to those who advocate the conquest of the Philippines as imperialists and not as expansionists, for the reason that expansion implies the enlargement of the same thing, the adding of more of that which you already have, the acquisition of countries holding a population capable of living and supporting our Constitution to be admitted as States into the Union; while the imperialist doctrine is the acquisition of tropical colonies where it is admitted that self-government can not exist, as we understand it under our Constitution; and therefore the people must be governed perpetually and forever as crown colonies of this Republic.

The holding of such countries, the conquest of an unwilling people, their retention in subjugation by a standing army, means of necessity not a republic where all the people must be consulted, but a despotism where the will of one man can march armies, declare war, and act with great rapidity. A republic is naturally slow in action, because the people must be considered and must be consulted.

We have taken on many of the semblances of monarchy and of imperialism in the conduct of this Administration—concealment of facts from the people, denial of news and information, no knowledge of what is going on, no announcement of policy and purpose; and the excuse for it all was that if we should allow the people to know the facts there was danger of creating disapproval of the course of our monarch, and if the enemy should secure those facts it would be of some assistance to them. This is necessary in a monarchy. Press censorship, too, is a necessary adjunct of imperialism, one of the things our forefathers would not have tolerated for a day. And yet our people are becoming so numb that they are willing to accept it, and even criticise men who protest. Lincoln says:

Those arguments that are made that the inferior race are to be treated with as much allowance as they are capable of enjoying; that as much is to be done for them as their condition will allow. What are these arguments? They are the arguments that kings have made for enslaving the people in all ages of the world. You will find that all the arguments in favor of kingcraft were of this class. They always bestrode the necks of the people, not that they wanted to do it, but because the people were better off for being ridden. That is their argument, and this argument of the judge is the same old serpent that says, "You work and I eat; you toil and I will enjoy the fruits of it." Then it is in whatever way you will, whether it comes from the monarch, the king, an excuse for enslaving the people of his country or from the north, of men of one race as a reason for enslaving the men of another race, it is all the same old serpent—

It is as true to-day as it was when Lincoln uttered it, and it will continue through all time and as long as men struggle for freedom:—

and I hold if that course of argumentation that is made for the purpose of convincing the public mind that we should not care about this, should be granted, it does not stop with the negro. I should like to know if taking this old Declaration of Independence, which declares that all men are equal upon principle, and making exceptions to it, where will it stop? If one man says it does not mean a negro, why not another say it does not mean some other man? If that Declaration is not the truth, let us get the statute book, in which we find it, and tear it out! Who is so bold as to do it?

While Lincoln lived and uttered these words forty years ago, there are men to-day in the Senate of the United States who are so bold as to be willing to go and tear them out.

A voice in the audience said, "No, no." Lincoln then said:

Let us stick to it, then; let us stand firmly by it, then.

Henry Clay took the same view on the subject, and I will read very briefly from what he said:

What is the foundation of this appeal to me in Indiana to liberate the slaves under my care in Kentucky? It is a general declaration in the act announcing to the world the independence of the thirteen American colonies, that "men are created equal." Now, as an abstract principle, there is no doubt of the truth of that declaration, and it is desirable in the original construction of society, and in organized societies, to keep it in view as a great fundamental principle.

But the difference, Mr. President, between the doctrines of the Republican party as founded by Giddings and Hale and Lovejoy and the party of PLATT and BEVERIDGE is not as great as the distance between Lincoln, the first President of the Republican party, whose greatest title is that of the Emancipator, earned by issuing on New Year's Day, 1863, the proclamation of emancipation, and McKinley, whose name must go down in history as the last of the Presidents of the Republican party, and whose chief claim for remembrance will lie in the fact that he restored slavery to our country and that under his Administration, under the protection of our flag—the Stars and Stripes—the slave driver plies the lash to the back of unrequited toil. Lincoln in his emancipation proclamation said:

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are and henceforward shall be free, and that the executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

President McKinley approved the treaty with the Sultan of Sulu, which provides:

ART. 3. The rights and dignities of His Highness the Sultan and his datus shall be fully respected, the Moros shall not be interfered with on account of their religion, all their religious customs shall be respected, and no one shall be persecuted on account of his religion.

And within that clause is embraced slavery and polygamy, both of them religious customs under the practice of Mohammedanism by the Sultan of Sulu.

But further than that, Mr. President:

Article 10. Any slave in the archipelago of Sulu shall have the right to purchase freedom by paying to his master the usual market value.

Nothing is said about where he is to get the consideration. The business of the Sultan of Sulu has been in the past to get into a quarrel with some of the negro tribes of the island of Mindanao, the largest island of the group, having an area nearly as great as the State of Indiana, and then, as an excuse for punishing them for having rebelled against his authority, to take prisoners and sell them as slaves to the planters raising sugar upon the island of Borneo. This is the way he gets money to carry on his business. Yet we have agreed in this treaty, ratified and sanctioned by the President of the United States, that we will not interfere with any controversy which exists between the Sultan and his subjects, but that they shall be tried and dealt with under the laws which he may make.

He is an absolute monarch, having the power of life and death. No one can question his right. If he commands his assistants to assassinate any one of his subjects, no one can call into question the act; yet we make an agreement with him whereby we pay him \$250 a month to fly the flag of the United States over his slave ships and over his harem.

ART. 13. The United States will give full protection to the Sultan and his subjects in case any foreign nation shall attempt to impose upon them.

Nobody else. And we have agreed not to again interfere to stop his slave ships or stop the practice of slavery and polygamy in that country. And yet the President says that the Stars and Stripes mean the same thing wherever they float!

Article XIII of the Constitution of the United States provides, in section 1, that:

— Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

* * * * *

Mr. PETTIGREW. The President of the United States, in his speech at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in October last, said:

That from the hour the treaty was ratified it became our territory: there was but one authority and but one sovereignty that could be recognized anywhere in those islands, and it became our duty to restore order, to preserve peace, to protect life and property.

Yet he went to war with the Christian people of that country, with those who believed in the Catholic religion, and made a treaty with the Mohammedans by which they were to set up and maintain their own government almost absolutely independent and free from us. If he had granted to the Christians of the Philippines the same rights he granted to the slaveholders and polygamists of the Philippines, there would have been no war whatever. And yet we, as a great Christian nation, select for self-government the slaveholding Mohammedans, occupying more than one-third of the area of the entire group, and proceed to establish what? Not Christianity, for they are already Christians; but we make the effort to shoot Protestantism into the Catholic population of the rest of the islands.

If our flag floats over that entire region, and if, as the President said, it is absolutely under the dominion and control of the Constitution of the United States, it seems to me that he violated the Constitution when he made the treaty with the Sultan of Sulu, and that he ought to be impeached.

Mr. President, it would be in accord more with my ideas of American institutions if we had gone to the Sultan of Sulu and said, "You must abandon polygamy and slavery, and if you do not do it and recognize the power and authority of the Government of the United States over the whole group of islands under your control we will wage war upon you until you do it," instead of going to the people who had been our allies, the Christian people of the northern islands, and saying to them, "Unless you surrender your constitution which you have adopted, and which is framed after our Constitution, unless you surrender your right as a government of a free people, we will proceed to kill you until you do." Instead of drawing a trail of blood over those islands, where the population can read and write, where they have embraced the same religion as ours and pray to the same God, it

would have been better had we attacked the so-called barbarous people of the southern island.

I might read several other extracts from the President's speech all to the same effect. He has hardly made a speech without an allusion to the flag, until I am almost convinced that he receives his direction from the English minister, for it is the same song always that England sings whenever she proposes to rob somebody. Whenever England concludes to go upon an expedition and plunder some of the weaker nations of the world, she makes her first appeal to patriotism, and then, step by step, goes on until she has committed the wrong, has transgressed, and then declares that the flag has been fired on and that no Englishman must question the right or wrong of what they are doing until the enemy is defeated and the country annexed.

We are pursuing the same course. Our Minister of State was trained in the English school, and he has come home with their ideas and their notions and is going to try their way of humbugging the people of this country as the people of England have been humbugged. You can do it in England, but you can not do it here. More than a million of the people of England do not vote. Most of the population have been degraded by being herded in manufacturing towns until a very large per cent of her population have no property, no capacity, and no opinions except to toady to the aristocracy.

How appropriate, Mr. President, that the restoration of slavery and the new interpretation of the Declaration of Independence should come together. It seems to me, however, that it marks the saddest chapter in the history of that great political organization, the Republican party. It came into being as a protest against slavery, as the special champion of the Declaration of Independence, and it goes out of being and out of power as the champion of slavery and the repudiator of the Declaration of Independence.

The President says that moral reasons compel us to stay in the Philippines, and that we, under God's direction, owe a duty to mankind, and more of similar cant. Here is what John Morley, the English statesman and writer and biographer of Gladstone, says with regard to England's policy in this same connection:

First—

Speaking of England—

you push on into territories where you have no business to be and where you had promised not to go; secondly, your intrusion provokes resentment, and, in these wild countries, resentment means resistance; thirdly, you instantly cry out that the people are rebellious and that their act is rebellion (this in spite of your own assurance that you have no intention of setting up a permanent sovereignty over them); fourthly, you send a force to stamp out the rebellion, and, fifthly, having spread bloodshed, confusion, and anarchy, you declare, with hands uplifted to the heavens, that moral reasons force you to stay, for if you were to leave, this territory would be left in a condition which no civilized power could contemplate with equanimity or composure. These are the five stages in the Forward Rake's progress.

There is not a thing there that does not absolutely accord with the excuses given by the imperialists, why we should abandon our former form of government and conquer and rule against their will an unwilling people. What blessing has England given to her colonies that has justified this plan throughout the world? Ireland came first, and the persecutions of Ireland were justified on a doctrine of benevolent assimilation—that they were Catholics, and therefore, unless they were converted from Catholicism, they

would go to the devil, and it was England's great and grand mission to make them Protestant anyhow. She has succeeded neither in the one nor the other. Her course in Ireland has been one of the blackest pages in the history of the world—starvation and plunder.

If England will govern Ireland as she has done, what right has she to the claim that she can confer benefits upon any country? What is there in England's example that can justify us in undertaking the same work? The miserable, miserable, contemptible rot of Rudyard Kipling where he talks about the white man's burden it seems to me in the light of English history is contemptible—the white man's burden to confer the curses of English rule upon the other nations of the world.

England commenced with Ireland. How is it with India? They have made no converts practically to Christianity in India; neither have the natives learned the English language. None of the people of India talk English. They have to keep an army of 210,000 men to hold them in subjection and prevent them from securing modern arms, modern implements of destruction, while they trample upon their rights as a people. What blessing has England conferred upon India? Nothing but the fact that taking away her food supply has caused the starvation of a million of men in India every year for years, and some years six or seven millions of people in a year. One hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of the food products of India are shipped away to pay pensions in England, and the result is that the want of that food causes the people of India to starve.

Compare the provinces of India that do not recognize English rule, that are under an English protectorate, and you will find that there is no starvation there. The native princes rule, and the people govern themselves, and England simply has a suzerainty over them. There is no starvation in those provinces; the starvation is in the English part of India, where the English system of robbery and plunder holds sway. India gives no money to the English treasury, but India is a field for exploiting private enterprise, and thus further enriching the already over-rich classes that govern the English Empire.

What of New Zealand? Did the conquest of New Zealand confer the blessings of Christianity upon New Zealand? Why, it resulted in the destruction of the inhabitants. To-day a great colony of English people are in New Zealand, but the inhabitants who formerly occupied that land have disappeared as the result of English government.

How is it in Egypt? The Egyptian Government was bad, and bad for the same reason that the English Government was bad; but England went into Egypt to enforce the collection of a usurious debt for money which Egypt never received. England went there to force upon that people a debt which was composed almost entirely of interest at 25 per cent on a small sum of money, until to-day every acre of Egypt that is tillable is taxed \$10 a year.

Every man, woman, and child in Egypt of native population, tilling and tilling the soil, is a slave to the English taxgatherer. Three thousand five hundred Englishmen wring the taxes by imprisonment and by the lash from those people, and yet the so-called civilized world looks on with approval. In order to better enlarge their capacity to pay taxes and bear burdens, the English officials have compelled those people to toil in a systematic manner, leav-

ing nothing for themselves but a bare existence and a bare subsistence. So it is everywhere that England has gone.

As I said before, England's first conquest was Catholic Ireland, and the excuse for oppression there was that the Irish were Catholics. How appropriate that in our first act in the drama of imperialism we should undertake the conquest of another Catholic country, should undertake the conquest of the Philippines, and should make the same miserable and contemptible excuse which has justified England's atrocities in Ireland during all time. From the pulpits of this country we hear prayers for our success in order that we may introduce Christianity. Oh, Mr. President, if we are to go to war against Catholics, it is not necessary to go half way around the world to do so. We have more of them at home, although there are 6,000,000 of them in the Philippines.

If these islands were rich in every mineral men desire, if their supplies of gold surpassed those of the Transvaal, if every other metal precious and desirable were in unlimited quantities, if their soil were so fertile that it surpassed even the famous valley of the Nile, if they could produce every comfort with half the effort with which it can be produced elsewhere throughout the world, yet I would oppose the annexation of these islands because it is wrong, because it leaves those who have sneered at us in our claim that we were advocates of freedom a justification for their sneer in the future.

But, Mr. President, I hold that we can not profit from these islands. None of our race live within the Tropics. There is not a colony of our race, the Aryan race, anywhere within 22 degrees of the equator. The men of our race who have been doing a commercial business in Manila do not have their families there. They raise a family of half-mixed natives in Manila and leave their real families at home. So it has been with commercial England through the Tropics everywhere, for you can no more produce a white man, a man of our blood, in the Tropics than you can a polar bear. Climatic conditions place their limits upon men just as firmly as upon plants and upon animals.

You can not claim that our race have not been colonists and that they have not gone forward to plant colonies throughout the world, for they have; but they settle in that belt around the world, between the twenty-fifth and fifty-fifth degrees of north or south latitude.

Jamaica has been an English colony for two hundred years. Jamaica has 4,200 square miles. It lies within the Tropics. It has a population of 633,000 people. How many Englishmen; how many Europeans? Including the garrison, including the officers, including the attachés of the Government, 14,600, and that is all. The rest are blacks. This island lies within the Tropics. It has an elevation of 7,000 feet. It is one of the most healthful of all the tropical islands.

And yet the European will not locate there. He goes to New Zealand, to southern Australia, to Canada. He abides where the frost chills man's blood and where clothing made of the wool of the sheep helps to keep him warm. I think you can lay it down as a proposition which can not be refuted that self-government and independence and high civilization are only embraced by people who find it necessary to wear warm clothes and who feel the tingle of the frost in their veins during a portion of a year.

The Leeward Islands have 701 square miles. They have 133,000

people, 5,000 of whom are Europeans. It is another English colony. These 5,000 are the garrison and the officeholders, with a few traders.

British Guiana, on the north coast of South America, has 109,600 square miles and a population of 280,000 people, which has been doubled in area, I think, very recently—negroes, contract laborers, coolies from India raising sugar, with 2,533 Europeans, including the garrison.

Haiti has a population of 600,000 people. It has 10,304 square miles. The language is French. Nine-tenths of the population are negroes, and the rest are mulattoes. You can say a thousand things about Haiti, about its healthful climate, about its wonderful productiveness, about its desirability. There is not a thing you may say about the Philippines that you can not say about this island with far more truth. White men will not live there because of the climate.

New Guinea, a British colony, lies between 8° and 10° of the equator and has 88,000 square miles.

New Zealand has an area of 104,000 square miles. It is near New Guinea. It is between the thirtieth and thirty-fifth degree of south latitude, and therefore outside of the Tropics. I give this illustration for the purpose of showing that it is a question of climate whether the white race will occupy a locality or not. Its population is 628,000 Europeans, 41,000 natives, and 4,400 Chinamen. It is near New Guinea. It is in the Temperate Zone. So the Anglo-Saxon went there and settled, and he has built up a government, freer, in my opinion, and better than ours, because untrammelled by interference, untrammelled by older influences. This colony was planted later than ours, and, unhindered by greed, by a combination of circumstances which have oppressed us and the English people, the people of New Zealand have worked out what Anglo-Saxon men untrammelled will always work out—a free government participated in by all the people. In my opinion they have better laws. In fact, they furnish about the only example of a first-class English government on the globe to-day.

The Straits Settlements are within the Tropics. There is there a population of 512,000 natives. Singapore, the commercial city, is a great city, one of the emporiums of the East, right under the equator. It is on the route from the Suez Canal to China and Japan. It contains 512,000 natives, 6,500 Europeans and Americans. The Europeans are the English garrison and the English officeholders. The few Americans who are there are engaged in trade and business with the East, and they go away in the summer. They go up to Japan; they go to the health resorts of that delightful country to escape the evil effects of a tropical climate.

It was supposed that the French people would occupy the Tropics, but they do not. The Latin race, more or less, has occupied the Tropics, but the frost of winter has touched the veins of the Frenchman. It has overcome the tendency of his Latin blood to live within the Tropics, and although they have conquered Tonquin, with 9,000,000 people, and Cochín China, with 3,000,000 more, there are only 3,000 Frenchmen in the whole country, including the officers and the garrison. The rest of the troops are natives.

Martinique is an island on the north coast of South America, of which we have heard much of late. Martinique has 187,000 people, and only 1,307 Frenchmen and Europeans of all classes. The balance of the population are blacks.

French Congo has a population of 7,000,000, and only 300 Europeans, besides the garrison.

So it goes the world over. Our people do not go to the Tropics. Our people will not live and raise families in the Tropics.

Mr. President, we are told by the President of the United States and by the orators who favor imperialism that this will be a paying venture—that trade follows the flag. Well, the morality of that argument can be fairly illustrated, I think, in this way: If a boy of a numerous family should cross a wide desert and find at the foot of a mountain an old man with a family of children, possessed of vast wealth in gold, jewels, horses, and cattle, and should return to his brothers and say, "There are nine of us, and I believe, if we go together, we can overturn the old man, who is not fit to bring up those children anyway, and rob him of his wealth, and I think it will be a profitable venture," and they should start out and accomplish that act, it seems to me they would stand upon exactly the same plane as the man who stands upon this floor and advocates taking all the Philippine Islands because it would pay.

But, Mr. President, trade does not follow the flag. If it be true that trade follows the flag, then England's trade with her colonies ought to be a good example and an argument in its favor. That ought to settle the question. Trade follows the best markets, and England's experience is a refutation of the doctrine that trade follows the flag.

Let us see. The total imports to England in 1856 were \$860,000,000 from all countries, and from her colonies and dependencies, \$215,000,000. England's imports from all countries in 1896 amounted to \$2,080,000,000, and from her colonies and dependencies, \$175,000,000. Twenty-five per cent of all her imports came from her colonies or dependencies in 1856 and but 8.3 per cent in 1896. After forty years, if trade follows the flag and has such a tremendous influence upon it, the percentage of England's trade with her colonies ought to have increased rather than declined. This is not conclusive, but the other facts taken in consideration with it are conclusive that trade does not follow the flag.

The total exports from England to the whole world and to her colonies in 1856 were \$575,000,000, and of this amount to her colonies and dependencies \$165,000,000. In 1895 her exports to the whole world were \$1,125,000,000, and to her colonies and dependencies \$350,000,000.

These figures show that the trade has not increased in proportion to the general increase. In the four years 1856 to 1859, inclusive, the colonies took 32.1 per cent of England's exports, and for the four years 1891 to 1895 they took 32.1 per cent; in other words, there was an increase of three-tenths of 1 per cent of her exports to her colonies during that time, although there were forty years of growth.

Now let us see how the total trade of her colonies compares with the trade of the colonies with the mother country. In 1856 \$340,000,000 was the total value of the exports from the English colonies to all the world, and \$215,000,000 of that trade went to England. The per cent of the colonial exports to England was 63.2 per cent of the total trade of the colonies in 1856. How was it forty years thereafter? In 1895 their total trade with all the world was \$1,310,000,000, and with England \$475,000,000, or 36.5 per cent—instead of an increase, a very great decrease.

Let us see how it is about the import trade. The English colo-

nies imported from all the world \$385,000,000 worth of imports in 1856 and \$165,000,000 from England, or 42.8 per cent. In 1895 it seems the value of the imports to the English colonies and dependencies from all the world was \$1,110,000,000, and from England \$350,000,000, or 31.5 per cent.

Thus the imports to the colonies from the mother country had declined from 42.8 per cent in 1856, forty years ago, to 31.5 per cent in 1895, showing that the colonies constantly decreased in the relative amount of their purchases from the mother country. If trade follows the flag, then more and more of their purchases ought to have been, it seems to me, from the mother country rather than a steady decline.

Let us see whether there is any cause why this should be so. We will take the English trade with the United States. In 1856 the total imports into England from all the world amounted to \$895,000,000, and from the United States to \$170,000,000, or 19 per cent of her total trade. In 1898 England's imports from all the world amounted to \$2,055,000,000, of which \$530,000,000 were from the United States, or 26.7 per cent of her total trade. In other words, our exports from England had grown from 19 per cent of all England bought to more than one-fourth of all she bought, while her trade with her colonies had continuously declined. Why was this? Not because trade follows the flag, but because trade seeks the cheapest and best market.

It will thus be seen that the increase from the United States is very marked as compared with the trade of England when compared with her own possessions. If we compare the total imports into England from the whole world and the United States for four years from 1870 to 1873 and from 1895 to 1898 we will find that the increase from the United States was very much greater in proportion than the increase of English imports from all countries. In other words, our imports increased 183 per cent as against England's imports from the rest of the world of 121 per cent.

English exports to the United States have declined from 13 per cent of her total exports in the four years from 1859 to 1862 to 9 per cent of her total exports for the years 1895 to 1898, caused by tariff restriction. But if trade follows the flag this tariff restriction which we place upon English goods, thus causing a decrease of imports to this country, certainly ought to have affected their purchases in the direction of her flag, and ought to have been an additional reason and inducement to purchase more instead of less of her colonies, where she could sell and not be restricted by tariff provisions and could bring back cargoes.

From another view of the subject, let us see how England's trade with her colonies and the United States compares with relation to population. From 1892 to 1897 England imported from her colonies \$1.25 worth of goods for each inhabitant of these colonies. From the United States she imported goods to the value of \$6.68 for every inhabitant of the United States each year. While the United States purchased of England \$1.50 worth for each inhabitant, the English colonies only purchased from England \$1.02 worth of goods for each inhabitant, purchasing 48 cents' worth for each inhabitant less than we bought from England, even with our purchase of only \$1.50 per capita.

So far as the English tropical colonies are concerned, England only sold to them 71 cents' worth of goods last year for each inhabitant in those colonies, and most of that was to supply her own army

and her own officeholders, who wanted English goods. Her trade would have been infinitesimal, almost absolutely nothing, with her tropical colonies, except for her army in India of 70,000 Englishmen and her equally great army of officeholders there. So, such an argument is all nonsense. Trade does not follow the flag.

The United States can only secure tropical countries as colonies. As Schurman, our commissioner to the Philippines, said, the Sultan of Sulu and his people would fight, and therefore it was not well to bother with them. So the people who inhabit the temperate zone will fight, and our only place to get a people who are easy to control, a people who will not fight too hard, a people who are not armed with modern implements of war, a people who can be run over with battalions of our troops, is in the Tropics.

How, then, in the light of England's experience, in the light of the fact that England has practically no trade with the inhabitants of her tropical colonies, except the trade that comes from supplying her officeholders and her army, can we expect to have much trade with the people of the Philippines? How are we going to get rich keeping a standing army in the Philippines, so as to make people whose wages are not over 5 cents a day trade with us?

Mr. President, in the Philippines we do not even supply our own Army. If trade follows the flag, it seems to me that the trade with our own Army ought to follow the flag. So prone is trade to seek the best markets that our Army is supplied with potatoes and beef and butter and pork from the English colonies; practically none of it comes from the United States.

Our soldiers are clothed by the English contractors at Hong-kong. Only shoes and a few canned goods go from the United States, and the reason they go is because we export shoes and that people everywhere can buy shoes cheaper in this country than anywhere else, thus proving conclusively that trade does not follow the flag, but goes to the best markets. The coal that propels our ships across the Pacific is English coal. We do not even patronize our own coal mines on the western coast. Every vessel coming this way or going that way in passing Nagasaki, takes on a load of English coal. Our transports are chartered by the Government, and, therefore, every transport carries goods from the United States free of cost to the producers. It seems to me exceedingly strange why, if trade will follow the flag, it does not get under the flag and just float over and supply our own army in the tropics.

What is there in the future to warrant us to believe that trade will hereafter follow the flag in the Philippines? I should like to have somebody tell me. We made a treaty with Spain by which we agreed that the Philippines should have the "open door," so that all the world could trade there through all time to come. Therefore we broke down the barriers of protection, abandoned the policy upon which the Republican party has ridden into power for years. We declared that we would have the "open door," thereby destroying absolutely all hope of any trade in the future with the people of the Philippines, for, under the decisions of our Supreme Court, we can not impose a tariff on their products unless we amend the Constitution.

So their products will come to us free of duty. The tobacco made into cigars by the nimble fingers of those capable Malays will close the tobacco and cigar factories of this country and drive our labor into other channels of employment. There is no reason

why they can not supply unlimitedly the cigars for American consumption. Labor there is cheap, labor is abundant, and New England's money—the vast fortunes of the men who have accumulated by the control of monopolies in our country—will go there to exploit this labor, go there to make cotton goods out of Chinese cotton to be sold in the American market.

Mr. President, I saw a cotton mill in China having 34,000 spindles, a modern mill, with, I think, 2,700 Chinese employees or laborers, every one of them men, full grown. There were no children and no women in that mill, and just one Englishman. Every other employee, every spinner, carder, weaver, engineer, every man running a loom, was a Chinaman; and the average wages—mark that—amounted to \$3.50 a month, and they board themselves. Besides, they were paid in silver, in Mexican dollars, equal to \$1.75 in our money. Yet the American laborer is invited to compete with 10,000,000 of this kind of labor by annexing the Philippines.

It seems to me the sum and substance of the whole scheme is to find a field where cheap labor can be secured, labor that will not strike, that does not belong to a union, that does not need an army to keep it in leading strings, that will make goods for the trusts of this country; and, as the trusts dominated the St. Louis convention and own the Republican party, it is a very proper enterprise for them to engage in.

England has not been enriched by her conquests. To-day, what is the happiest country in the world? It is little Switzerland. Where is there the best distribution of wealth, the best opportunity for man? Where is there the least poverty, misery, and distress? It is in Switzerland, without colonies. It is not in England. Her conquests have bestowed no blessings upon her people. Most of her people have no property; most of the people of England own nothing. Two-thirds of them—66 per cent of them—own nothing, while about 22,000 persons own all the property of Great Britain.

They are the people who exploit the tropical colonies: they are the people who build railroads and charge what they choose, and make loans at usurious interest, thus piling up higher and higher their great aggregations of wealth. Do we want to follow this example? From it no money will come into the Treasury for the benefit of the people of the United States. The laborers of this land, from whom we raise our taxes in the same way England raises hers—by a per capita levy upon consumption—are invited to contribute this taxation to support an army of occupation and subsidize ships to carry the trade in order that those people may be exploited by the trusts of the United States. I do not believe the people of this country will do it.

There is another object. It is well when people become restless, when people become dissatisfied with the conditions which exist, when the toilers of a land begin to believe they are not receiving their just share of the products of their toil, to give them amusement, to distract their attention by distant problems, to do as England has done, begin the killing of men in some distant land, and then appeal to the patriotism of the people and talk about the flag being fired upon in order to take the attention of the people from those great problems the right of solution of which is essential to the happiness of the toilers of the nation.

You ask me what I would do with the Philippines. I would

draw our army back to Manila. I would send to the Philippine people assurance that they could set up their own government—a republic, such as they have set up under their constitution, framed after ours, providing, as it does, for universal education, for the protection of life and property, and I would say to the world, “Hands off!” Then I would try to neutralize that country—that is, I would try to make a treaty with the nations of the world by which those islands and their waters should be neutral ground, where any vessel of any country could go and coal and trade—not free trade, if they chose to put up a tariff wall against all the world, but it should be equal to all; but no nation could go there to fight.

I would do what Europe has done with Switzerland and what they have done with the Suez Canal; and if the nations of all Europe would not agree to it, I would say, “Hands off: we will plant a republic on the shores of Asia.” The Malay race have shown their capacity for governing in their triumph in Japan. No nation in the world stands higher in the scale of civilization than the Malays of Japan, a kindred race to the people of the Philippines. Give them a chance, and they will plant republican principles on the shores of Asia that will spread to that continent and undermine and overthrow the despotism of colonial rule and the despotism of monarchies.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Dakota would not do that, of course, without the consent of the Filipinos?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No, sir; I would not do it without their consent. It seems to me a superfluous question if that is all there is to it.

We are precluded by our Constitution and by the Declaration of Independence and by every claim we have ever made, by every speech of every person who has addressed a Fourth of July audience, from buying sovereignty over a people without their consent first obtained. Purchasing sovereignty and transferring from one nation to another the rights of their fellow-men is simply a species of slavery. How can we justify it with all our boasted eloquence once a year for a century past? I say this Republic, above all the nations of the world, ought to refuse to be a party to the purchase or the effort at purchasing sovereignty over anybody.

In 1867, when we talked of buying the Danish West Indies, Denmark refused to sell until a vote of the inhabitants could be taken, to see whether or not they would consent to be sold. Even Denmark, touched by the influence of our Constitution and our example, refused to sell the sovereignty without the consent of the people, and for this great Republic to stand up to-day before the world and claim title because they have bought from dispossessed Spain sovereignty over those people it seems to me is remarkable indeed.

I think the words of the immortal Lincoln are applicable to this situation: “A house divided against itself can not stand.” Under our flag you can not have a republic and an empire. You can not have self-government and a government by force. One or the other will triumph. Either the republic will go down and the empire survive, or we will at once retrace our steps to the old safe ground and anchor our ship of state to the declaration and to the

doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

* * * * *

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado says that I never speak a kind word of my fellow-Senators. I am not going to dispute that assertion except to say that my relations are most pleasant with almost all my fellow-Senators, and I hope he will not undertake to hide the whole Senate behind his large personality. I have not spent much time in laudation of him, because I never saw anything in his public career or private life worthy of praise; but I will confess one thing, and that now, which ought to be to his praise and to his advantage—he has a loud voice. It seems to me that his attack upon me is not worthy of reply, and I shall not reply to it.

As far as his argument is concerned, he has divided his attention between me and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE]. I should like to know, I should like to hear, I should like to ascertain some settled policy upon this question. We are told by the Senator from Indiana that it is greed, conquest, for the purpose of getting rich, with the idea of despoiling somebody, and we are told by the Senator from Colorado that we are prompted by ideas of philanthropy, but not quite so much philanthropy as the Senator from Indiana wishes to exercise.

Now, Mr. President, this cant about doing somebody good was the very argument which justified Spain in her conquests of the western world. No people ever went forth for conquest and for plunder who paraded more their pretext that they wished to civilize and Christianize the world. They drew their trail of blood across Mexico. What men in all the world had more religious zeal than Cortez and his followers and his priests? Pizarro destroyed the grand civilization of Peru, butchering her people right and left in the name of God. They said they did it because they wanted to confer blessings upon the people of these countries, and they made them desolate for centuries afterwards.

Russia in her conquest raises the same banner, and her newspapers are full of the same argument, the same cant.

You can pick out Spanish authors whose books are in our library, hundreds of them, who parade this excuse for conquest better than even the Senator from Colorado. And so it is with England. Wherever she has gone, wherever she has carried her conquest, as I read a short time ago, the same excuse has been made: "We are going to carry the blessings of English civilization." If you should ask the people where she has been—if you ask Ireland, and India, and the natives of New Zealand—what their opinion is of the blessing and benefit she has conferred, it seems to me it would deter us from undertaking the task.

I should like to know what the argument is? You can not smother debate or drive me from a discussion of the question by ridicule or abuse. Call me a traitor if you will. Men have been called traitors before because they stood up for what they believed to be right. Lincoln, in the House of Representatives, denounced the Mexican war and voted against its approval, and so did Alexander Stephens, of the South, and so did Boutwell, of Massachusetts, and so did many other names that might be added to the list.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Boutwell was not in the House at that time.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator from Massachusetts says that

Mr. Boutwell was not there then, and I presume I am wrong in regard to that, although I heard him in a speech say that he took that position, which perhaps was not in the House of Representatives, and he believed that more than anything else had made him twice the governor of Massachusetts. What is more, Mr. President, Daniel Webster denounced the Mexican war and afterwards was charged with being a traitor to his country by these same people who have a philanthropic mission.

Fox and Pitt in the English Parliament denounced the war against the American colonies. Is it Lord North and his miserable cabinet who live in the minds of the people of the world to-day? No: it is those champions of freedom who dared to stand up in the British Parliament and denounce the course of their government of that day. Pitt said:

What has the Government done? They have sent an armed force, consisting of 17,000 men, to drag on the Bostonians into what is called duty; and we are told in the language of menace that if 17,000 won't do, 50,000 shall. If I were an American I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I would never lay down my arms—never, never.

I should like to know what course this debate is to take. If those who are in favor of imperialism are afraid to embrace the doctrine of greed and of conquest for profit and disagree about the amount of philanthropy that is necessary in order to justify their position, it is hard to tell what we shall answer or combat.

In this connection, Mr. President—for I do not care to talk longer—I wish to put in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let us be honest," from the Washington Post, of this city. It seems to me it is quite pertinent in this connection as showing how badly divided are the hosts of imperialism.

LET US BE HONEST!

Why can not we be honest in our utterances, touching the territories we have recently acquired? Really it would save time and trouble, to say nothing of life and treasure, to come out frankly with the announcement that we have annexed these possessions in cold blood, and that we intend to utilize them to our profit and advantage. All this talk about benevolent assimilation; all this hypocritical pretense of anxiety for the moral, social, and intellectual exaltation of the natives; all this transparent parade of responsibility and deep-seated purposes; all this deceives nobody, avails nothing, helps us not an inch in the direction of profit, dignity, and honor.

We all know down in our hearts that these islands, groups, etc., are important to us only in the ratio of their practical possibilities. We value them by the standard of their commercial usefulness, and by no other. All this gabble about civilizing and uplifting the benighted barbarians of Cuba and Luzon is mere sound and fury, signifying nothing. Foolishly or wisely, we want these newly acquired territories, not for any noble humanitarianistic purposes, but for the trade, the commerce, the power, and the money there are in them. Why beat about the bush and promise and protest all sorts of things? Why not be honest? It will pay.

As a matter of fact, we are not concerned in the ethical or political uplifting of the Philippines. After all, the difference between a high-sheep and a starched shirt front is a mere matter of climate and personal opinion. It is honesty, untruth, crime, and general wickedness are here in our midst, as constant with us as part of our daily life and every day of our growth. We need not go to the West Indies or the Philippines in search of mankind's moral rescue. Our own slums abound with opportunities for misdoing and death.

Why not tell the truth and say what is the fact, that we want China, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon, together with any other islands in the ocean that may hereafter command themselves to our political advantage, because we believe they will add to our national strength, and because we expect they will some day become purchasers at our bargain counters? We might as well throw off the pious mask and indulge our desire for commercial gain and power. It will cost us nothing, and it may profit much. At least, we need not have the comfort and satisfaction of being honest with our selves. We have the privilege of looking into the mirror without blushing. *Washington Post, Sunday, January 14, 1900.*

I present that as an answer to the whole philanthropic portion of the speeches of the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Colorado.

But in order to bring this debate back, it seems to me, to a higher plane and better character, I will read briefly, some verses by Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago:

THE CREED OF THE FLAG.

Who will haul down the flag? *President McKinley.*

"Who will haul down the flag?" quoth he.

Why, no hand of flesh and bone

Can lower that flag, on land or sea.

Till the faith of the flag is gone!

Till a few shall rule and cunningly keep

The bunting to garnish their greed;

Till dollars are dear and humanity cheap

By the force of a tory creed!

Then will it fall!—but answer us, clear,

Do you fancy that hour is drawing near?

Did our Liberty Bell ring in vain?

Was our Declaration a lie?

Must we turn to the Old World again,

With the penitent prodigal's cry?

Must we arm us and march in the van

Of Europe's barbaric parade,

And boom out a gunpowder gospel to man

To open a pathway for trade?

Shall we strut through the world and bluster and brag

With the dollar mark stamped on the brave old flag?

Nay, haul up the flag—raise it high—

Not yet is its spirit spent!

Let it sing to the wind and the sky

The truth that it always meant!

Let it sing of the birthright of man,

Of progress that never can lag,

Let it sing that trade may go—where it can.

But liberty follows the flag!

Yea, haul up Old Glory— but, comrades, take heed

That no man part the old flag from the creed!

HOWARD S. TAYLOR.

CHICAGO, January 7, 1899.